



**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

RECEIVED  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/607,676	06/30/2000	Warren Keith Edwards	XERX-01041US0 MCF/JEF	1239
23910	7590	12/05/2003	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY, LLP			PAULA, CESAR B	
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 400			2178	5
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111			DATE MAILED: 12/05/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/607,676	EDWARDS ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> CESAR B PAULA	<b>Art Unit</b> 2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2001.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2002 is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

### Attachment(s)

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_ .  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_ . 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_ .

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the application filed on application, and IDS filed on 6/30/2000, and 4/2/2001.

**This action is made Non-Final.**

2. Claims 1-51 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 11-13, 15, 17, 23, 29, 34, 40, and 46 are independent claims.

***Priority***

3. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 120, where this application is a continuation in part of 09143802, 09143551, 09144231, 09143777, 09143772, 09144032, 09143778, 09144143, 09143555, 09144383, 09143773 to 8/31/98 is acknowledged.

***Drawings***

4. The drawings filed on 11/21/2002 have been accepted by the examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The examiner failed to find in the specification where an application interface layer received a document from the bit provider, and in turn providing the document to an application as recited in claim 15 (limitation b).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1-2, 4, 6, and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Koppolu et al, hereinafter Koppolu (Pat.# 5,801,701, 9/1/1998, filed on 9/4/1996).

Regarding independent claim 1, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report document for a manufacturing project—*entity*. In this case, data—*content information*—from a source, a project management program, in a chart format—

*associated property*—is utilized. The data is made up of scheduling data (col.1, lines 27-col.2, line 11, fig. 1-2).

Moreover, Koppolu teaches the copying—*identifying the data source*— of the scheduling data, which is in chart format—*associated property*—, from the project management program to a clipboard (col.1, lines 30-34, 44-47, fig. 1-2).

Furthermore, Koppolu teaches the pasting of the scheduling data from the clipboard to a document created with a word processing program, and —*retrieving the content information from the data source, and providing it to define the report document* (col.1, lines 58-col.2, line 11, fig. 1-2).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report—*task*— for a manufacturing project (col.1, lines 27-col.2, line 11, fig. 1-2).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report—*object*— for a manufacturing project (col.1, lines 27-col.2, line 11, fig. 1-2).

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Koppolu teaches the copying of the scheduling data, which is in chart format, from the project management program document—*data source*— to a clipboard (col.1, lines 33-36, fig. 1-2).

Regarding independent claim 11, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report document for a manufacturing project—*entity*—. In this case, data—*first, and second content*— from two different sources, a project management, and a spreadsheet program, and two different formats—*first, and second properties*— are utilized. The data includes scheduling, and budgeting data (col.1, lines 27-col.2, line 11, fig. 1-2).

Moreover, Koppolu teaches the copying—*identifying the first data source*— of the scheduling data, which is in chart format—*first associated property*—, from the project management program to a clipboard (col.1, lines 30-34, 44-47, fig. 1-2).

Moreover, Koppolu teaches the copying—*identifying the second data source*— of the budgeting data, which is in spreadsheet format—*second associated property*—, from the spreadsheet program to the clipboard (col.1, lines 30-34, 46-56, fig. 1-2).

Furthermore, Koppolu teaches the pasting of the scheduling, and budgeting data from the clipboard to a document created with a word processing program, and —*retrieving the first, and second content information from the first and second data sources, and combining them to define the report document*— (col.1, lines 58-col.2, line 11, fig. 1-2).

Regarding independent claim 12, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report document for a manufacturing project—*entity*. In this case, data—*content information*— from a source, a project management program, in a chart format—*associated property*— is utilized. The data is made up of scheduling data (col.1, lines 27-col.2, line 11, fig. 1-2).

An operating system—*bit provider*—, such as Windows 3.1 is used for copying, pasting and editing the data (col.1, lines 30-34, 44-47, col.7, lines 50-67, col. 12, lines 23-67, and fig. 1-2).

Moreover, Koppolu teaches the copying—*identifying the data source*— of the scheduling data, which is in chart format—*associated property*—, from the project management program to a clipboard (col.1, lines 30-34, 44-47, and fig. 1-2).

Furthermore, Koppolu teaches the pasting of the scheduling data from the clipboard to a document created with a word processing program, and —*retrieve the content information from the identified data source, and providing it to define the report document* (col.1, lines 58-col.2, line 11, fig. 1-2).

Regarding independent claim 13, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report document for a manufacturing project—*entity*—. In this case, data—*first, and second content*— from two different sources, a project management, and a spreadsheet program, and two different formats—*first, and second properties*— are utilized. The data includes scheduling, and budgeting data (col.1, lines 27-col.2, line 11, fig. 1-2).

An operating system—*bit provider*—, such as Windows 3.1 is used for copying, pasting and editing the data (col.1, lines 30-34, 44-47, col.7, lines 50-67, col. 12, lines 23-67, and fig. 1-2).

Moreover, Koppolu teaches the copying—*identify the first data source*— of the scheduling data, which is in chart format—*first associated property*—, from the project management program to a clipboard (col.1, lines 30-34, 44-47, fig. 1-2).

Moreover, Koppolu teaches the copying—*identify the second data source*— of the budgeting data, which is in spreadsheet format—*second associated property*—, from the spreadsheet program to the clipboard (col.1, lines 30-34, 46-56, fig. 1-2).

Furthermore, Koppolu teaches the pasting of the scheduling, and budgeting data from the clipboard to a document created with a word processing program, and —*retrieve the first, and second content information from the first and second data sources, and combining them to define the report document* (col.1, lines 58-col.2, line 11, fig. 1-2).

Regarding claim 14, which depends on claim 13, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document using interfaces (SDI, and MDI), which allow an application to communicate, and send messages to the operating system—*bit provider*—, which in this case is Windows 3.1. (col. 12, lines 23-67, col.13, line 63-col.14, line 67, and fig. 14A).

Regarding independent claim 15, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report document for a manufacturing project—*entity*—. In this case, data—*first, and second content*— from two different sources, which are stored in a storage are—disk or memory—*data storage layer*—, a project management, and a spreadsheet program, and two different formats—*first, and second properties*— are utilized. The data includes scheduling, and budgeting data (col.1, lines 27-col.2, line 11, fig. 1-2).

Further, Koppolu also teaches providing a set of “OLE” functions for creating application interfaces—*document management layer*—which allow software applications —*application layer*—to communicate with respective application data (col.9, lines 36-67). As we can observe

above, the applications must go through the OLE interfaces in order to access the application data stored in memory—*document management layer interposed between the data storage layer and the application layer*.

An operating system—*bit provider*—, such as Windows 3.1 is used for copying, pasting and editing the data located in memory—*data storage layer* (col.1, lines 30-34, 44-47, col.7, lines 50-67, col. 12, lines 23-67, and fig. 1-2).

Moreover, Koppolu teaches the copying—*identify the first data source*— of the scheduling data, which is in chart format—*first associated property*—, from the project management program to a clipboard (col.1, lines 30-34, 44-47, fig. 1-2).

Moreover, Koppolu teaches the copying—*identify the second data source*— of the budgeting data, which is in spreadsheet format—*second associated property*—, from the spreadsheet program to the clipboard (col.1, lines 30-34, 46-56, fig. 1-2).

Further, Koppolu teaches the pasting of the scheduling, and budgeting data from the clipboard to a document created with a word processing program —*retrieve the first, and second content information from the first and second data sources, and combining them to define the report document* (col.1, lines 58-col.2, line 11, fig. 1-2).

Furthermore, Koppolu teaches the pasting of the scheduling, and budgeting data from the their respective applications interfaces —*application interface layer to provide to an application through clipboard, and to a document created with a word processing program displayed on an interface —retrieve the first, and second content information from the first and second data sources, and combining them to define the report document* (col.1, lines 58-col.2, line 11, fig. 1-4).

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 15, Koppolu teaches the pasting of the scheduling, and budgeting data from the their respective applications interfaces —*application interface layer to provide to an application* through clipboard, and to a document created with a word processing program displayed on an interface. The interfaces-- *application interface layer*-- of the respective application programs provide the document to the user, so that the user can interact with the document (col.1, lines 58-col.2, line 11, fig. 1-4).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 3, 5, 7-10, 17-25, 28-36, 39-40, 42-48, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koppolu, as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Vertelney et al, hereinafter Vertelney (Pat. # 5,341,293, 8/23/1994).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report document for a manufacturing project. In this case, data— *content information*-- from a source, a project management program, in a chart format—*associated property*—is utilized. The data is made up of scheduling data (col.1, lines

27-col.2, line 11, fig. 1-2). Koppolu fails to explicitly disclose: *the entity is a person*. Vertelney discloses an element for representing a user, and for storing a recording of the user's voice (col. 14, lines 48-67, fig. 11). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) to identify a user within documents, and enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report for a manufacturing project—*entity* (col. 3, lines 52-67, col.18, lines 6-19, fig. 15c-d). Koppolu fails to explicitly disclose: *the entity is a device*. Vertelney discloses that the element is inserted into a document, and is programmed for performing certain functions in the computer, such as printing a document data with a printer, mailing a document with a computer, etc (col. 3, lines 52-67, col.10, lines 1-33, fig. 3-4b). The printer is used for printing the document is the device being represented by the element which is inserted into a document. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) to mark, find, organize, and process data within documents, and enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report for a manufacturing project—*entity* (col. 3, lines 52-67, col.18, lines 6-19, fig. 15c-d). Koppolu fails to explicitly disclose: *the data source is a device*. Vertelney discloses that the element is programmed for performing certain functions in the computer, such as printing a document data with a printer, mailing a document with a computer—*data source*—, etc (col. 3, lines 52-67, col.10, lines 1-33, fig. 3-4b). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) to mark, find, organize, and process data within documents, and enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 1, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report for a manufacturing project—*entity* (col. 3, lines 52-67, col.18, lines 6-19, fig. 15c-d). Koppolu fails to explicitly disclose: *the device is a phone*. Vertelney discloses that the element is programmed for performing certain functions in the computer, such a phone element for storing people's phone information, printing a document data with a printer, mailing a document with a computer, etc (col. 3, lines 52-67, col.10, lines 1-33, fig. 3-4b). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) to mark, find, organize, and process data within

documents, and enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 7, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report for a manufacturing project—*entity* (col. 3, lines 52-67, col.18, lines 6-19, fig. 15c-d). Koppolu fails to explicitly disclose: *the device is a printer*. Vertelney discloses that the element is inserted into a document, and is programmed for performing certain functions in the computer, such as printing a document data with a printer, mailing a document with a computer, etc (col. 3, lines 52-67, col.10, lines 1-33, fig. 3-4b). The printer is used for printing the document is the device being represented by the element which is inserted into a document. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) to mark, find, organize, and process data within documents, and enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 7, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report for a manufacturing project—*entity* (col. 3, lines 52-67, col.18, lines 6-19, fig. 15c-d). Vertelney discloses allowing a user to view, and mark photographs (col. 11, lines 35-67, fig. 6b). Koppolu, and Vertelney fail to explicitly disclose: *the device is a camera*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney to have a camera

be represented by a document, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) to mark, find, organize, and process data within documents, and enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10). This would enable a user to utilize a camera element in the document to represent a camera which takes a picture to marked and processed according to Vertelney's invention above.

Claim 17 is directed towards a method for implementing the method found in claim 5, where the physical device is a printer, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 17, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report for a manufacturing project—*entity* (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 18, lines 6-19, fig. 15c-d). Koppolu fails to explicitly disclose: *the device is a telephone, and the content information includes a phone number*. Vertelney discloses the creation of a document representing a phone, and including phone numbers (col. 13, lines 10-67, fig. 8b-c). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) to mark, find, organize, and process data within documents, and enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 19, which depends on claim 17, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report for a manufacturing project—*entity* (col. 3, lines

52-67, col.18, lines 6-19, fig. 15c-d). Koppolu fails to explicitly disclose: *the device is a telephone, and the content information includes a phone number*. Vertelney discloses the creation of a document representing a phone, and including phone numbers (col. 13, lines 10-67, fig. 8b-c). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) to mark, find, organize, and process data within documents, and enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 20, which depends on claim 17, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report for a manufacturing project—*entity* (col. 3, lines 52-67, col.18, lines 6-19, fig. 15c-d). Koppolu fails to explicitly disclose: *the device is a printer, and the content information includes a list of outstanding print jobs*. Vertelney discloses the creation of a document representing a phone, and including the number of outstanding print copies to be printed (col. 10, lines 16-31, fig. 4a-b). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) to mark, find, organize, and process data within documents, and enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 21, which depends on claim 17, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report for a manufacturing project—*entity* (col. 3, lines

52-67, col.18, lines 6-19, fig. 15c-d). Vertelney discloses allowing a user to view, and mark photographs--*images* (col. 11, lines 35-67, fig. 6b). Koppolu fails to explicitly disclose: *the physical device is a camera, and the content information includes image data*, and Vertelney fails to explicitly disclose: *the physical device is a camera*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney to have a camera be represented by a document, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) to mark, find, organize, and process data within documents, and enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10). This would enable a user to utilize a camera element in the document to represent a camera which takes a picture to marked and processed according to Vertelney's invention above.

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 17, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report for a manufacturing project, using a windows or a different operating system (col. 3, lines 52-67, col.18, lines 6-19, fig. 15c-d). Koppolu fails to explicitly disclose: *the physical device is a UNIX machine, and the content information includes status information for the UNIX machine*. Vertelney discloses the creation of a document representing a phone, and including the number of outstanding print copies to be printed (col. 10, lines 16-31, fig. 4a-b). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney, and have used machines or printer in an UNIX environment, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) to mark, find, organize, and process data within documents, and enhancing a

document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10).

Regarding independent claim 23, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report document for a manufacturing project—*entity*. In this case, data—*content information*—from a source, a project management program, in a chart format—*associated property*—is utilized. The data is made up of scheduling data (col.1, lines 27-col.2, line 11, fig. 1-2). Koppolu fails to explicitly disclose: *representing a physical device as a document*. Vertelney discloses that the element is inserted into a document, and is programmed for performing certain functions in the computer, such as printing a document data with a printer, mailing a document with a computer, etc (col. 3, lines 52-67, col.10, lines 1-33, fig. 3-4b). The printer is used for printing the document is the device being represented by the element which is inserted into a document. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) to print data within documents, and enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10).

Furthermore, the limitations: *a bit provider configured to:.....through limitation iii)* are directed towards similar limitations found in claim 12, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claim 24 is directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claim 14, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 25, which depends on claim 24, Koppolu teaches the editing of a compound document by receiving additional data and storing it in the compound document (col.7, lines 50-col.8, line 67). Koppolu fails to explicitly disclose: *send the additional content information to the identified physical device*. Vertelney discloses allowing a user to send a document to specified user(s) via email (col. 7, lines 52-67, col. 9, lines 1-67). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney to have a camera be represented by a document, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) to email data within documents, and enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 25, Koppolu teaches the editing of a compound document by receiving additional data and storing it in the compound document (col.7, lines 50-col.8, line 67). Vertelney discloses allowing a user to send a document to specified user(s)—*email address*— via email (col. 7, lines 52-67, col. 9, lines 1-67). Koppolu, and Vertelney fail to explicitly disclose: *the communications path is established at least in part over a LAN*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney, because this would provide the benefit of processing information according to Vertelney's invention among a group of users in a same local network such as a company LAN.

Regarding independent claim 29, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report document for a manufacturing project. In this case, data—*content information*—from a source, a project management program, in a chart format—*associated property*—is utilized. The data is made up of scheduling data (col.1, lines 27-col.2, line 11, fig. 1-2). Koppolu fails to explicitly disclose: *representing a person as a document*. Vertelney discloses an element for representing a user, and for storing a recording of the user's voice (col. 14, lines 48-67, fig. 11). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) to identify a user within documents, and enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10).

Furthermore, the limitations: *a bit provider configured to:.....through limitation iii)* are directed towards similar limitations found in claim 11, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 30, which depends on claim 29, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report document for a manufacturing project (col.1, lines 27-col.2, line 11, fig. 1-2). Koppolu fails to explicitly disclose: *the first data source is an image file, and the first content information includes image data*. Vertelney discloses an element for representing a user using a photo image, and for storing a recording of the user's voice (col. 14, lines 48-67, fig. 11). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) to identify a user within documents, and

enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 31, which depends on claim 29, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report for a manufacturing project—*entity* (col. 3, lines 52-67, col.18, lines 6-19, fig. 15c-d). Koppolu fails to explicitly disclose: *the first content information includes an email address*. Vertelney discloses allowing a user to send a document to specified user(s)—*email address*-- via email (col. 7, lines 52-67, col. 9, lines 1-67). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney to have a camera be represented by a document, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) to email data within documents, and enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10).

Claim 32 is directed towards a method similar to the steps found in claim 18, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 33, which depends on claim 29, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report for a manufacturing project—*entity* (col. 3, lines 52-67, col.18, lines 6-19, fig. 15c-d). Koppolu fails to explicitly disclose: *the first content information includes a list of files*. Vertelney discloses the creation of a document representing a phone, and including the number of outstanding print copies to be printed-- *a list of files* (col. 10,

lines 16-31, fig. 4a-b). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) print documents, and enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10).

Claim 34 is directed towards a method, where the bit provider is as the one described in claim 12 above, similar to the steps found in claim 29, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claims 35-36 are directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claims 14, and 25 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claim 39 is directed towards a system similar to the system found in claim 28, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 40 is directed towards a method, where the travel approval process is not explicitly taught by Koppolu, and Vertelney, and is similar to the steps found in claim 1. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) track a project such as the travel process, and enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10), and therefore this claim is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 42, which depends on claim 40, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report for a manufacturing project—*entity* (col. 3, lines 52-67, col.18, lines 6-19, fig. 15c-d). Koppolu fails to explicitly disclose: *the computational process includes monitoring of a kernel*. Vertelney using interface elements to indicate progress in a printing process as performed in a computer having a Windows operating system (col. 10, lines 16-31, fig. 4a-b). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) print documents, and enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10).

Claim 43 is directed towards a method, where the travel approval process is such as the project described by Vertelney (col.11, lines58-col.12, line 7, fig.6c), similar to the steps found in claim 1, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 44 is directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claim 14, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 45, which depends on claim 44, Koppolu teaches the editing of a compound document by receiving additional data and storing it in the compound document (col.7, lines 50-col.8, line 67).

Claim 46 is directed towards a method, where the hiring process is not explicitly taught by Koppolu, and Vertelney, and is similar to the steps found in claim 12. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, and Vertelney, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) track a project such as the hiring process, and enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10), and therefore this claim is similarly rejected.

Claim 47 is directed towards a system similar to the system found in claim 14, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claims 48, and 51 are directed towards a system similar to the system found in claim 45, and therefore are similarly rejected.

11. Claims 26-27, 37-38, and 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koppolu et al, in view of Vertelney, as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of Hoirup et al, hereinafter Hoirup (Pat. # 6,397,054 B1, 5/28/2002, filed on 7/30/1998).

Regarding claim 26, which depends on claim 25, Koppolu teaches the editing of a compound document by receiving additional data and storing it in the compound document (col.7, lines 50-col.8, line 67). Vertelney discloses allowing a user to send a document to

specified user(s)—*email address*— via email (col. 7, lines 52-67, col. 9, lines 1-67). Koppolu, and Vertelney fail to explicitly disclose: *the communications path includes a short message service('SMS') gateway*. Hoirup discloses the provision of as SMS gateway for allowing cell phone users to send and receive short text messages (col. 1, lines 16-40, col. 4, lines 10-67, and fig.2). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, Vertelney, and Hoirup, because Hoirup teaches above allowing a user to send, and receive short text messages while using a cell phone.

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 25, Koppolu teaches the editing of a compound document by receiving additional data and storing it in the compound document (col.7, lines 50-col.8, line 67). Vertelney discloses allowing a user to send a document to specified user(s)—*email address*— via email (col. 7, lines 52-67, col. 9, lines 1-67). Koppolu, and Vertelney fail to explicitly disclose: *the communications path includes an email gateway*. Hoirup discloses the provision of as SMS gateway for allowing cell phone users to send and receive short text messages (col. 1, lines 16-40, col. 4, lines 10-67, and fig.2). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, Vertelney, and Hoirup, because Hoirup teaches above allowing a user to send, and receive short text messages while using a cell phone.

Claims 37-38 are directed towards a system similar to the system found in claims 26-27 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 49-50 are directed towards a system similar to the system found in claims 26-27 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

12. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koppolu et al, in view of Vertelney, as applied to claim 40 above, and further in view of Cohen et al, hereinafter Cohen (Pat. # 6,324,543 B1, 11/27/2001, filed on 3/6/1998).

Regarding claim 41, which depends on claim 40, Koppolu teaches the generation of a compound document, which represents a report for a manufacturing project—*entity* (col. 3, lines 52-67, col.18, lines 6-19, fig. 15c-d). Vertelney using interface elements to indicate progress in a printing process as performed in a computer having a Windows operating system (col. 10, lines 16-31, fig. 4a-b). Koppolu, and Vertelney fail to explicitly disclose: *the operation of a Java RMI, and the content information includes an object named in the RMI registry.* Cohen teaches the migration, and monitoring of objects using a Java RMI, and objects listed therein (col. 7, line 64- col.8, line 40). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Koppolu, Vertelney, and Cohen, and use the interface elements of Vertelney to monitor progress of a migrating process using an RMI, because Vertelney teaches the advantage of permitting a user(s) print documents, and enhancing a document intuitiveness through the use of graphical elements (col. 3, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-10).

***Conclusion***

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Yamashita et al. (Pat. # 6,233,224), Vora et al. (Pat. # 5,819,273), Aikens et al. (Pat. # 6,216,113), Salgado et al. (Pat. # 5,872,569), and Sklut et al. (Pat. # 5,760,775).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

- (703) 703-872-9306, (for all Formal communications intended for entry)

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,**

Application/Control Number: 09/607,676  
Art Unit: 2178

Page 26

**Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).**



CESAR B PAULA  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2178

12/1/03